

EQUAL RIGHTS

"MEN AND WOMEN SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE
UNITED STATES AND EVERY PLACE SUBJECT TO ITS JURISDICTION"

Amendment to the United States Constitution now before Congress.



My Country Is Glad To Honor Women

By FERNANDO DE LOS RIOS, Spanish Ambassador

American Women Must Clear Their Thinking

By EUDORA RAMSAY RICHARDSON

Editorial---A Surrender

April 1, 1937

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Washington, D. C.

Vol. 23, No. 6

Price Five Cents

Equal Rights



Official Organ
of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.
Phone, Atlantic 1210

Published Semi-Monthly at
406 W. Redwood St., Baltimore, Md.

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879

Subscription, \$1.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, \$1.50

HELEN HUNT WEST

Editor

CONTRIBUTORS

ALMA LUTZ

EMILY PERRY

EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER
ETHEL ADAMS CROSBY, Circulation Chairman
GERTRUDE I. GEORGE, Advertising Manager

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Chairman, Mrs. Stephen Pell, N. Y.

Vice-Chairmen:

Gall Laughlin, Me. Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
Secretary, Mrs. Harvey W. Willey, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura M. Berrien, Ga.

Ethel Adamson, N. J.	Burnita Shelton Matthews, Miss.
Nina Allender, D. C.	Alice Lee West Movius, Mass.
Edwina Austin Avery, D. C.	Mary Murray, N. Y.
Abby Scott Baker, D. C.	Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Rebekah S. Greathouse, D. C.	Alice Paul, N. J.
Elsie M. Hill, Conn.	Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N. Y.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.	Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.	Betty Gram Swing, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.	Anne Bayard Underwood, D. C.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.	Grace Hoffman White, Conn.
Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.	Helen Clegg Winters, Ohio
Alma Lutz, Mass.	Clare Snell Wolfe, Ohio

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships, and in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the National Constitution and the Equal Rights Treaty.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Introduced, Senate—By Senator Townsend, Del., and Senator Burke, Nev.,
Feb. 5, 1937

(Senate Joint Resolution No. 65)

House—By Representative Ludlow, Ind., Jan. 5, 1937

(House Joint Resolution No. 1)

Present Status—Senate—Before Judiciary Committee.

House—Before Judiciary Committee.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS TREATY

Article I

"The contracting States agree that upon the ratification of this treaty men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions."

Signed—By the Governments of Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay,
and Uruguay at Montevideo, December, 1933.

Insanity, Not Protection!

THE attorney general of Connecticut has ruled that employment of female nurses in manufacturing plants or female pharmacists in drug stores after 10 P. M. is illegal.

The statutes definitely forbid employment of minors and women in mercantile, manufacturing or mechanical plants after 10 P. M., the attorney general states in an opinion to Labor Commissioner Joseph M. Tone. A drug store is defined as a mercantile establishment.

Under this law an adult woman pharmacist, trained for her profession, is classed with children and deprived of her means of making a livelihood. By what stretch of the imagination do some persons term this "protection"? Under the same law a trained nurse is prohibited from practicing her profession in a plant operating at night. Unfortunately the law cannot control the hours of illness, therefore if a nurse cannot work whenever there is illness, she also is deprived of the job. This is not protection, IT IS INSANITY!

"Flamboyant Feminism"

THE day of "flamboyant feminism" is over, according to Mrs. Jouett Shouse, who made the statement while participating in a panel discussion at the close of the national convention of the American Association of University Women March 18, in Savannah, Ga.

Mrs. Shouse declares the objectives have been won and the job now remaining is cooperation between men and women in the business of living.

Mrs. Shouse is entirely correct in declaring that men and women must work together in solving the problems of the present and future, but the day of feminism, flamboyant or otherwise, is not over until women attain the equality that will place them in position to successfully cooperate and compete with men in the business of living and in solving the problems that confront them.

As long as women find it necessary to dissipate their efforts in shaking off the shackles that bind them merely because they are women, they cannot possibly give freely of their time and talents toward the cooperation that is necessary for the successful attainment of those things desirable for everyone.

Feminism is the term applied to the movement to wipe out discriminations against women based solely on sex. When those discriminations no longer exist, the day of "flamboyant feminism" will *actually* be over. With more than one thousand discriminatory laws remaining on the statute books of the states; with legislative bodies still legislating to prohibit women working at certain hours and to fix by law the minimum wage they may be paid, but maintaining a hands-off policy in regard to their male competitors, feminism *cannot* be over.

Feminism is merely the revolution of women who demand to be persons and full fledged citizens. It is the natural reaction of an oppressed class to a right to develop along all lines, to make a living in a competitive field unhampered by restrictions that do not apply equally to all who compete, and to receive the same rewards for their labor. It is the effort of women to free themselves from the unnatural so-called "protection" that has stunted their growth in every direction. Arms and limbs that are tightly bound soon wither and become useless. Little girls, for generations, have been told they must not climb trees or take violent exercise through which their brothers were allowed to develop physically. They likewise were discouraged intellectually and were forced to live lives that did not make for mental development.

Feminism in the United States is the demand of women, who constitute one-half of the population, to share democracy in a nation that boasts of its Democratic form of government.

No, Mrs. Shouse, the day of feminism, even flamboyant feminism, is *not* over. It will *not* be over until a Democratic government recognizes the wisdom of granting to women complete equality with men and places them in position to work with men on equal terms toward a better future for all. This it can do by passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, guaranteeing that equality. "Flamboyant feminism" can hasten that day. The National Woman's Party calls upon all women and men who oppose *any* form of slavery, economic or otherwise, to campaign for the freedom of women.

The objectives of feminism won, it will then be possible for men and women to work together, contributing the talents and ability of each for the good of all, and as Mrs. Shouse would say, the day of "flamboyant feminism" will be over.

A Surrender!

AS EQUAL RIGHTS goes to press there comes the astounding news that the United States Supreme Court, through the switch of Justice Roberts, reverses itself on the constitutionality of minimum wage legislation discriminating against women.

This decision establishes the unsound doctrine that while men may work for any compensation they please, women cannot work except for wages at or above a level fixed by legislatures or governmental boards or agencies. Moreover, it assumes that the *liberty of women is not as precious as the liberty of men.*

Last June this court held that "prescribing of minimum wages for women only would unreasonably restrain them in competition with men and tend arbitrarily to deprive them of employment and a fair chance to find work." Now, like a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the Court says it protects women to arbitrarily fix their wages by laws for women that do not apply with equal force to men workers, whom the law leaves untouched.

If minimum wages applied to both men and women, then women would be at no disadvantage.

March 29, 1937, the day of the amazing decision, was a bad day alike for the Court and for the women of the country. Both were losers.

If there could be a good side to a surrender of the constitutional protection hitherto afforded women in respect to their right to bargain for their own services, it undoubtedly is the fact that nothing could make more apparent the immediate necessity for the Equal Rights Amendment. Without it women are *serfs of government*. Without it women become almost automatically an unemployment problem. Women wholly capable of supporting themselves and their families will be forced upon relief rolls, *not through necessity, but through legislation.*

If women were not aroused prior to this decision, they should now throw themselves with tremendous zeal into the fight for the Equal Rights Amendment as their only hope. Hitherto they have felt the security of their rights under the Constitution and the belief that the Supreme Court would uphold this principle, as it had thirteen years ago in the Adkins case, adhering to it consistently ever since *until this astounding decision.* The present repudiation of its entire former opinion which it has previously upheld again and again, is unique in the annals of the Supreme Court. This surrender women had not anticipated.

The opinion of the Court, which purports to "protect women from unscrupulous employers," *does not even attempt* to protect them from their competitors. The Constitution, which does not change, and which guarantees rights, now apparently not only has changed, but denies rights. Could there be a more potent argument for a specific guarantee such as would be given women by an Equal Rights Amendment; something that would weather the hysteria of politically created emergencies and stand as a bulwark of protection to citizens of the United States?

Spain Accords Women Absolute Equality

WOMEN of Spain have been guaranteed absolute equality with men by the Loyalist Government through a decree promulgated by the Anarcho-Syndicalist Minister of Justice, Juan Garcia Oliver.

The decree ordered:

"The equality of man and woman must be absolutely without limits, other than those imposed by nature. A woman, when married, should be a true companion, and, either married or single, should have the same powers to discharge civic functions as a man.***"

"Any shadow of marital authority, or restriction or privilege on the part of one or the other of the sexes is absolutely incompatible with the dignity which each possesses.****"

An Associated Press dispatch from Valencia, Spain, in commenting upon the action, says:

"It was a signal concession to the women of Loyalist Spain, who have shouldered rifles and fought side by side with the defenders of the government. Thus in time of war they have shown they could fight. In time of peace, the decree will mean they may possess property in their own name and have the right to make contracts."

Women of America have not shouldered rifles in time of war, but they have shouldered heavier burdens than rifles and side by side with men have fought every war that has been fought for Democracy. The principal difference between the United States and Spain in the attitude toward women, is the difference in the recognition accorded women for the part they have taken.

"MY COUNTRY IS GLAD TO HONOR WOMEN"

"The women of Spain have been so splendid in working side by side with men in the defense of their government, even shouldering arms and offering their lives, my country is glad to accord them recognition and guarantee them without limit absolute equality with men."

"Under the recent decree promulgated by the Minister of Justice, women of Spain attain complete equality of status with men. Spain is glad thus to express her appreciation of her women."

(Statement made to EQUAL RIGHTS by HIS EXCELLENCY FERNANDO DE LOS RIOS, Spanish Ambassador to the United States, relative to the granting by his government of absolute equality to women with men.)

The Loyalist Government of Spain has chosen to confer upon Spanish women "absolute equality," while the Government of the United States has not yet taken this forward step.

In promulgating the equality decree, the Minister of Justice calls attention to what he terms "the archaic privileges" of the husband. With a stroke of the pen he raises women of his country from the status of the benighted medieval ages to the level of the twentieth century.

Interviewed in Washington regarding the Spanish equality decree, His Excellency Fernando de los Rios, Spanish Ambassador to the United States, expressed gratification at the action of his government.

"The women of Spain have been so splendid," he said. "They have worked side by side with men in defending their government and Spain is glad to accord them this recognition."

It is indeed heartening to women of other countries where equal rights are still not a reality, to see that some nations are bestowing

upon women full benefits of citizenship and equality in all fields.

It is interesting to note that Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay, Spanish speaking countries, were first to sign the Equal Rights Treaty at Montivideo in 1933. Spain now grants women equal rights.

Centuries of traditional sex prejudice are swept away in Spain and women and men are actually side by side in planning their future.

Treasury Department Outlines Its Attitude

EQUAL RIGHTS is in receipt of a communication from Josephine Roche, assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, which it gladly publishes, together with a copy of one written by Miss Roche to Miss Parkhurst, Director of Organization, National Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Lack of editorial space was the only reason for not quoting the letter in the editorial to which Miss Roche refers. The paragraph omitted provided subject matter for a future editorial dealing with the willingness of the Treasury to consider the question of amending the regulations to cover married women in states where the disability has already been removed. The subject of the editorial in question was not what might be done in the future, but the status of married women under the present regulations. The editorial called attention to the fact that had there been an Equal Rights Amendment in the Constitution, there could be no such discrimination because of sex and marriage.

The attitude of the Treasury in expressing willingness to consider amending the regulations to cover women in certain states is of course gratifying. However, there still remains the fact that women in states where the disability has not been removed, would not

be benefitted. The Equal Rights Amendment would cover all women in all states.

The two letters from Miss Roche relative to the matter in which she no doubt is as genuinely concerned as are other women, follow:

"Dear Mrs. West:

"My attention has been called to the February 15th issue of EQUAL RIGHTS, which carries quotations from a letter which I wrote to Miss Marian Parkhurst, Director of Organization, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., of New York City, in reply to an inquiry from her. Inasmuch as a most important paragraph of the letter was omitted in the EQUAL RIGHTS article, I am herewith transmitting a copy of my original letter, which I should appreciate your publishing in full.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOSEPHINE ROCHE."

"January 23, 1937.

"Dear Miss Parkhurst:

"I have at last gotten the information from our Gen-

(Continued on Page 48)

The Minimum Wage and Maximum Hour Trap

A DISPATCH to the Cincinnati *Enquirer* dated March 9 tells of the fight of Ohio women against the Boyd Bill introduced in the Ohio legislature and proposing to limit the working hours of women in industry in that state to forty hours a week.

Appearing before the Senate Labor Committee, to which the bill had been committed upon its introduction, Helen Robbins Bitterman, President of the Ohio Branch of the National Woman's Party, Mrs. Ruth McNeil, an Ohio working girl, and Agnes B. Dickinson, former assistant attorney general of Ohio, argued against the bill.

Mrs. Bitterman pointed out to the committee that the bill was designed to harm the working women of Ohio rather than aid them, as women would be replaced by men should the bill become law.

Mrs. McNeil contended that wages would be lowered by enactment of the bill. "Are you really trying to aid women, or are you trying to help the organization of labor union?" Mrs. McNeil asked the committee. She stated that she was in the dry-cleaning business and that there was no labor union she could join.

Mrs. Dickinson pleaded with the committee to make the law equal for men and women. "The real sweat shops of Ohio," she said, "are in the homes, where women work for \$3 a week, and not in industry."

All three women demanded that the state enforce the present fifty-hour week law before adopting a forty-hour week law.

Ohio women opposing the discriminatory legislation against women have been informed that the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor may send representatives to Ohio to assist in enacting the legislation as it has previously done in other states. Those who believe it their right to work for a living without the restrictions imposed upon them by so-called protective laws that hamper them in their competition for jobs, *question the right* of the Department to use federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation in the states.

Miss Louise Stitt, of the Division of Minimum Wage of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor was recently in Michigan in the interest of such legislation, just as two years ago she bent her efforts toward bringing about the passage of a minimum wage law for women only by the Florida legislature. Admitting at that time that the fair basis for such legislation was a law that would affect men and women workers alike, Miss Stitt said: "Men will not have it. If the bill covers all workers, men will defeat it."

At a regional labor standards conference held in Columbia, S. C., last year, Wendell Heaton, president of the Florida Federation of Labor, reported to the conference that on account of opposition from unexpected sources in Florida, the bill applying to women only had failed, but that there would be offered in the next legislature a bill covering workers, on which they hoped there would be agreement.

The Florida legislature will be in session early in April. Already there has been prepared a bill providing for minimum wage legislation for women. For

WOMEN QUESTION RIGHT OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR TO USE FEDERAL FUNDS TO INFLUENCE STATE LEGISLATION

two years the Women's Division of the Department of Labor has been working toward the accomplishment of this legislation for the

State of Florida. Representatives have been endeavoring to bring about the formation of a legislative committee to *put it over* on the women of Florida—for that is what it amounts to wherever it is attempted.

Florida working women, Ohio working women, Michigan working women and others throughout the United States, where the significance of it is understood, know that it is the short cut to eliminating women from the economic field.

Florida women will again be used as "guinea pigs" for experimentation. There is always a possibility of obtaining assistance in passing these laws by those who are deluded into thinking they are doing something to help women. Why should not such laws apply to a job rather than a sex? Would a restaurant do much business if it advertised a meal at one price for a woman and another price for a man? Where does the price belong? On the meal, of course, just as the wage belongs on the job, not the sex.

There is no certainty that an industry now employing only women, will always do so. If it becomes difficult to employ them and if the law compels them to open their books for inspection by boards or commissions, is there anything in any of these proposed laws to prevent them from firing them and hiring men? There is not!

If they must pay to women a wage fixed by law and if men are free to bargain for their own services and underbid them, is there anything in the law to compel them to hire women? There is not!

If minimum wage and maximum hour laws are good for labor—then *apply* them to labor . . . not *just* to women. Labor is those who work. Women are part of it and desire to be treated as such. Why is there such a determination to avoid a minimum wage and maximum hour law for men, but an equal determination to force it upon women? In Florida, for instance, the opposition to the minimum wage bill for women proposed amending the bill to read "persons," rather than "women," and stated that the fight was NOT against minimum wage, but against applying it to women only and leaving men workers free to "scab on them." Proponents of the measure refused to allow the substitution, which would have covered all workers.

If there is a sincere effort to be made to help workers, there is a correct approach. Those who desire women out of the economic field *know* what they are doing and are employing the effective method. Those who honestly want to help women should use common sense in selecting a way. If they will fairly consider the matter and are intelligent, they cannot fail to recognize the correctness of the argument of those opposing the one-sided legislation. If they recognize its fairness, they are guilty of a great crime against the working women of America in attempting to further hamper them in their struggle for a living. Only ignorance could excuse them, and once informed THERE IS NO EXCUSE!

Pros and Cons of the Equal Rights Amendment

OVER Radio Station WJZ and the Blue network of the National Broadcasting Company, on March 22, the pros and cons of the Equal Rights Amendment were debated at length by six women prominent in organizations representing the two schools of thought on this important question.

Arranged by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, which is studying the question, Miss Charl Ormond Williams, national president, presided.

Since the last convention of the Federation in 1935, many individual business and professional women's clubs and a number of state federations have endorsed the amendment, which is a part of the study program. So far, the National Federation has taken no action, as there has been no convention since 1935. Since that time, however, business and professional women throughout the United States have recognized the danger to their jobs through so-called "protective legislation" and many of them have been actively campaigning for the Equal Rights Amendment as the best means of affording them protection.

Mrs. Stephen Pell, national chairman, National Woman's Party, the first speaker introduced, told the radio audience why the National Woman's Party sponsored the Equal Rights Amendment. She stated that the Amendment puts first things first; that the Constitution is the place for the expression of fundamental liberties and expressed the opinion that it should treat the basic rights of women as it treats the basic rights of men. Women she said, were not remembered in the Constitution at the time it was written, and because they were not remembered then, the amendment is proposed now to remedy that omission. "There still exist almost a thousand laws throughout the United States," she said, "discriminating against women. To work to remove these discriminations one by one is a costly, lengthy procedure, and gains made in one legislature can be swept away in a succeeding legislature. * * * Constitutional changes are more permanent. * * * Moreover, equal opportunity in industry must be once and for all established. Discrimination in the basic right to earn one's living is a flagrant violation of our rights."

Concluding, Mrs. Pell said: "Its enactment would stem the tide of anti-social legislation discriminatory to women now sweeping the world. The Equal Rights Amendment will write in our national Constitution a guiding principle as correct for the future as for the present—that sex shall not be a barrier." Profound study and research, she declared, have gone into the work for the Equal Rights Amendment.

Miss Dorothy Kenyon, lawyer, representing the League of Women Voters, stated that the right to a fuller life with equal opportunities for all, regardless of race, creed or sex is the goal of all who call themselves liberals, but added that achievement of that goal is one of the most complex questions a democracy can face. The Constitution, she said, is full of magic

NATIONALLY PROMINENT WOMEN DEBATE QUESTION IN RADIO BROADCAST IN WHICH SIX SPEAKERS PARTICIPATED

EDITOR'S NOTE: The debate on the subject of the Equal Rights Amendment was arranged by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and was broadcast March 22 over Station WJZ and the Blue network of the National Broadcasting Company. Organizations represented among the speakers were the National Woman's Party, National League of Women Voters, Young Women's Christian Association and the National Women's Trade Union League.

phrases such as "due process," "equal protection of the law," and so on. Discriminations against women, she said, take all sorts of forms and expressed the opinion that no mathematical formula like "equality" would cover all. Each problem, she said, must be dealt with in its own setting. She advocated eliminating discriminations one at a time, while the Woman's Party contended that this method meant an endless task with no permanency, as legisla-

tures could replace the discarded laws and add others as rapidly as legislative bodies convene. "Thus, and thus only will we gain our common end, the achievement of a fuller life and of equal opportunities for all," concluded Miss Kenyon.

Miss Williams then introduced Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, for years a leader of women, and daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, pioneer suffragist, who, the introducer said, "gave her an inheritance of liberal thinking of which she has always made the most."

Speaking of the advantage or disadvantage to women in being singled out in a competitive labor world from men workers and having their hours of work and wages specially regulated, she said: "As usual, society is quite ready to use women as the guinea pigs for experiment in the laboratory of labor! This seems odd to my logical mind as the sons of Adam are never weary of telling us how much weaker the daughters of Eve are than men. Well then you, the big stronger brothers, step forward and carry the whole burden of tests and experimentations! You test the outcome of minimum wage laws; you test the fixing of hours for this group or that of male workers, and when and where it is crystal clear just what the results are, we, the decrepit, will refuse the gifts the Greeks offer, or we will rush in and divide the benefits with you. But let me warn you, a sound test of hours and wages cannot be made for limited groups of the workers in a trade. Protecting as well as unionizing can only be satisfactorily done for a whole industry."

"I happen to know personally of unhappy results following specially arranged tours into the dreamland of protection. A 'no night work' law thirty years ago shut women printers out of newspaper work. * * * If we are cynics, we can point out that it sounds more generous to run a competitor out of the market by declaring the risk to her health in night work, than the risk to the health of your pocketbook in her unchecked rivalry."

The next speaker was Miss Rhoda McCullough, editor of the Woman's Press, Y. W. C. A. publication, who called the question an "outmoded one" and as "inconsequential as an argument as to what General Grant should have done, which he did not do, on a May morning in the Civil War period." The only issue today, she declared, is whether men and women alike shall have a fair chance to secure a decent livelihood. "It is a human cause," she said, "and not a woman cause." Discriminations against women are

increasing, she added, especially in the professions. She advocated minimum wage and maximum hour legislation for all workers, but still clung to the idea of protective legislation for women only "until laws establishing a decent minimum can be enacted for all workers—both men and women." Modern women, she said, are no longer interested in their "rights."

Betty Gram Swing, of the National Council, National Woman's Party, spoke next, prefacing her remarks by saying: "What we are proposing is really an amendment to the bill of rights in the Constitution. We want women to have equal rights under the law now enjoyed by men. Every one of the difficulties mentioned by Miss Kenyon in defining equality exists too in defining equality between men. But since we have managed somehow to exist for a hundred and fifty years while giving equality to men, I feel sure we can exist for another hundred and fifty by giving equality to women." Mrs. Swing divided laws discriminating against women into two groups: those which have been enacted because men considered women inferior and wanted to keep them so, and those passed with the intention of helping women—the so-called protective laws. Referring to the effect upon state laws of passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, she declared that it would be a mandate to the states to equalize their laws. "It isn't blanket legislation," she said, "any more than any other principle in the bill of rights."

Touching on "protective legislation," she said that if working conditions are bad, they are bad for men as well as women; if wages are too low, they are too low for men too. "As long as men and women workers do not have collective power, it may be unavoidable for a time to protect them by law," said Mrs. Swing. "What we are discussing is whether such laws should be written for women only." She pointed out that when employers have to submit their books for inspection; have to fill out endless forms and cannot use women as they do men in special emergencies, the result is that they think it a nuisance to have women workers and merely replace them by men and boys, who are free of restrictions.

Declaring that the Woman's Party is sometimes accused of being theoretical, she said, "I say to you that we are just as theoretical as the men who drafted the bill of rights. That wonderful charter of liberties also is embodied in amendments to the constitution. What we are working to do is to bring it up to date, to include in it the women who still are refused real equality before the law."

The last speaker was Mabel Leslie, of the National Women's Trade Union League, who challenged what she called the "theory of equal rights" to remedy unequal pay for women workers. She said: "Those of us who oppose the proposed Equal Rights Amendment have spent little time and energy in that opposition. Instead, we have been advocating constructive steps by which we are achieving equality here and now." She referred to the fact that her organization supported minimum wage and maximum hour laws for women workers because they believed such a step established equality. Referring to women in industry she said: "I want to make clear, if I can, the difference in the types of work done by men and women in the same factory. In a candy factory, for instance, the men are the cooks and receive good pay. The women are the packers and are generally very badly paid. There is no competition on the job. A minimum wage in this industry would provide a living wage for women, and help therefore to equalize wages in the whole industry."

The attitude of the Woman's Party relative to this

type of argument, is that the Party contends that special labor legislation in such industries, even though in some particular industry it may affect women on jobs held only by women, naturally creates competition where none hitherto existed. The Party has pointed out that the men have no corner on the jobs as "cooks with good pay," nor have the women any guaranteed corner on the jobs as "packers badly paid." They desire to see men and women hold jobs on a basis of ability and to compete for jobs in a fair competition that recognizes not sex, but workers. They object to jobs being classified as "men's jobs" and "women's jobs." They point out that this tends to keep women in a separate working class and is unfair in a democracy where they believe there should be equal economic opportunity.

In closing the debate, Miss Williams thanked the participants on behalf of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women and said: "As I listened to you, I was struck with the fact that all of us here today campaigned for the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment which gave women the right to vote. United we won the century-long battle for votes for women." She then expressed the hope that women's viewpoints would again be united.

How You Can Do Your Bit

Throughout the United States there are women who desire to do their bit in campaigning for the Equal Rights Amendment, but do not know how to make their assistance felt.

A Woman's Party Founder has started a One-Dollar-Fund, a contingent fund for which there is great need *immediately* and to which everyone interested is urged to contribute. It will make possible much necessary work that otherwise could not be undertaken at this time and will pay great dividends to women of the nation who will benefit through passage of the Equal Rights Amendment with its guarantee of equality between men and women.

In order that everyone may be able to contribute to this fund, the following three methods have been devised:

You may give—

- One dollar a year
- One dollar a month (\$12 a year)
- One dollar a day (\$365 a year)

Send as soon as possible your contribution, basing your pledge on your ability to give and your belief in Equal Rights.

Address "One Dollar Fund, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street, Northeast, Washington, D. C."

Prospect 5858

Est. 1922

Investment Service for Women Only

GERTRUDE I. GEORGE

Realtor

FOUNDER and DIRECTOR

WOMEN'S SERVICE DEPARTMENT

1009 South Grand Ave.

Los Angeles, Cal.

Special Agent

INVESTORS SYNDICATE EST. 1894.

Home Office: Minneapolis, Minn.

Exclusive Sales Representative

BLUEBIRD CANYON PARK and ESTATES

BEAUTIFUL SITES FOR HOME OR INVESTMENT
WITH REAL OCEAN VIEW

Information Upon Request

Laguna Beach, California

American Women Must Clear Their Thinking

"THE Richmond Business and Professional Women's Club does not endorse the Women's Charter and regrets that the name of the organization has been used in connection with the charter and affirms that such use of the name must be unauthorized since there has been no action taken concerning this charter on the part of the convention body of the organization. We believe in equality for men and women and deplore any differentiation that will inevitably lead to discrimination."

These are the words with which the Richmond Business and Professional Women's Club condemned the proposed Women's Charter. They express, I think, the opinion of ninety-five per cent of the members of the national organization. Because for three and a half years as National Field Representative I traveled throughout the country, reaching clubs everywhere, I should know whereof I speak. Business and professional women within and without the organization are opposed to special privilege and to restrictions based upon sex.

At the last biennial convention held in Seattle, July, 1935, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs declared by means of an unequivocal resolution that it wanted no so-called protection for themselves—no restrictive or discriminatory legislation. It is unthinkable, therefore, that the organization should be willing to endorse for industrial women the sort of program that it believes detrimental to the interests of its own members. Not a voice was raised in opposition to the resolution. Here it is:

"Since the Federation has declared for equality of opportunity and economic parity between the sexes and

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN ARE OPPOSED TO RESTRICTIONS BASED UPON SEX

By Eudora Ramsay Richardson

EDITOR'S NOTE: Eudora Ramsay Richardson, well-known author and for years prominent in the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, was for nearly four years National Field Representative of this organization. Her reaction to the so-called Women's Charter as expressed in "American Women Must Clear Their Thinking," is similar to that expressed by women of the same organization in many sections of the United States, who show indignation because of the fact that the name of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs has in any way been connected with the proposed Women's Charter, which is contrary to their already established principles and which they feel endangers the interests of working women. A number of the State Federations affiliated with the National have endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment.

for the establishment of just and humane labor standards to cover all types of wage earners, irrespective of sex, and whereas we believe that aptitude, training and efficiency should govern the securing and retaining of employment and the opportunity for advancement, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs declares itself as opposed to all legislation, business customs and policy which discriminate against the business and professional woman, including the clerical classification."

Therefore, when two "representatives" of the Federation were reported through the press as having signed the proposed Women's Charter, I was not greatly concerned, because I knew that they were without authority. Doctor Mary Beard also appeared among the list of alleged signers. Yet I heard Doctor Beard say that she had signed nothing and had gone to the meeting merely to hear whatever proposal might be made. It is, of course, deplorable that the name of the Federation should have been connected with the charter and accordingly with proposals that are at variance with the spirit of a pronouncement made at the last convention of the organization.

If American women do not clear their thinking with regard to the whole question of equality of opportunity, we stand in danger of losing the gains that have been made and of finding ourselves in the position occupied now by the women of Central Europe. It is a safe prediction that at the convention to be held in Atlantic City next summer the Federation will not endorse the Women's Charter. Other organizations likewise will repudiate it if the full meaning of those contradictory words dawns upon their members.

Treasury Department Outlines Its Attitude

(Continued From Page 44)

eral Counsel in regard to the married woman surety question. Perhaps the simplest thing to do would be to quote exactly what I received from the office of our General Counsel:

"Paragraph 11 of the regulations governing the issuance of duplicate checks provides:

"When a surety is a woman, it should appear affirmatively that she is single, as a married woman will not be accepted as surety."

"As you are no doubt aware, it has been only recently that state statutes have expressly removed the disability of coverture and enacted enabling legislation permitting a married woman to act as surety. Even at the present time, this is not true in all states. It would appear that the Government might not be adequately protected by a bond

executed by a married woman, as surety, domiciled in a state where she has no capacity to become a surety.

"I am pleased to advise you that the Treasury will be glad to consider the question of amending the regulations to permit a married woman, domiciled in a state where the disability has been removed, to become a surety on a bond taken in connection with the issuance of a duplicate check."

"I would suggest that if your correspondent wishes to reopen the matter, she write directly to the General Counsel of the Treasury Department and refer to this correspondence between us.

"With all good wishes,

"Sincerely yours,

"JOSEPHINE ROCHE."